



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/671,435

09/24/2003

Robert H. Kelley-Wickemeyer

03004.8094US

2918

64066 7590 05/15/2009
PERKINS COIE LLP (BOEING)
P.O. BOX 1247
PATENT - SEA
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER

SWIATEK, ROBERT P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3643

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/671,435 | Applicant(s) KELLEY-WICKEMEYER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Rob Swiatek | Art Unit 3643 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rob Swiatek. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. John M. Wechkin. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 13 May 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 13, 14, 19, 23-25, 32, 34, 35, 40-42, 47, 52, 62-64 and 72.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sweeney et al. (US 3,790,106), Razak (US 3,362,659), Brine (US 4,784,355), Jennings (US 5,207,400).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative discussed prior art rejections in Office action and how claims might be amended to overcome them. The "step" separating the wing from the flap structure was emphasized as a difference between cited art and the instant invention. The 112 rejections were reviewed and amendments to overcome them proffered.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| /Rob Swiatek/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643 | |
|--|--|